UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,159	01/22/2007 Dai Gil Lee		LEED3010/REF	6592
23364 BACON & THO	7590 05/12/200 OMAS, PLLC	EXAMINER		
625 SLATERS	LANE	FRIDIE JR, WILLMON		
FOURTH FLOO ALEXANDRIA	ok a, VA 22314-1176		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/12/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		A	pplication No.	1	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary			10/573,159		LEE ET AL.		
		E	xaminer		Art Unit		
		l v	/illmon Fridie		3724		
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this commun	ication appea	rs on the cover shee	et with the co	orrespondence a	ddress	
A SHO WHICH - Extens after S - If NO p - Failure Any rej	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M ions of time may be available under the provisions X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comn eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum st to reply within the set or extended period for reply bly received by the Office later than three months a patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATI of 37 CFR 1.136(a nunication. atutory period will a will, by statute, cau	E OF THIS COMMI). In no event, however, m pply and will expire SIX (6) use the application to become	UNICATION hay a reply be time MONTHS from to me ABANDONED	he mailing date of this (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status							
2a)□ 1 3)□ 8	Responsive to communication(s) file This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the practi	2b)⊠ This ac for allowance	tion is non-final. except for formal r			e merits is	
Dispositio	n of Claims						
5)⊠ (6)⊠ (7)⊠ (8)□ (8)□ (4 4 10)□ T	he specification is objected to by the he drawing(s) filed on is/are: Applicant may not request that any objected to by the second second including the second including th	e Examiner. a) accept ction to the dra	ection requirement ed or b) objected wing(s) be held in ab is required if the draw	t. d to by the E eyance. See wing(s) is obje	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 C	• •	
,	he oath or declaration is objected to	by the Exam	iller. Note the attac	ched Office	ACTION OF TOTAL	10-132.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
2) Notice 3) Informa	s) of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Fation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/23/06</u> .	PTO-948)	Paper 5) Notice	riew Summary (r No(s)/Mail Da e of Informal Pa ::			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zempel (2435065).

Zempel (2435065) discloses a composite tool bar having a composite body part with a plurality of bites (14)mounted on the composite body part along a longitudinal direction, the composite tool bar comprising: a first insert (12) inserted into the composite body part while passing through the composite body part, with a bite mounting hole (17) provided in the first insert to receive a bite therein, and a bite height adjusting hole (23) axially aligned with the bite mounting hole in the first insert to receive therein a bite height adjusting bolt (27) for adjusting a height of the bite inserted into the bite mounting hole; and a second insert (13) inserted into the composite body part to be coupled to a

Page 3

first side of the first insert, with a bite holding hole (17) provided in the second insert to receive therein a bite holding bolt (21) and wherein the first insert is fitted into and fastened to an insert hole, formed through both the composite body part through an interference fitting process.

Zempel (2435065) discloses and substantially all of the subject matter set forth in the claims except for a composite body covered with a covering. To provide the device of with a covering would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the since all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 8-10 are allowed.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Willmon Fridie whose telephone number is 571 272 4476. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday.

Application/Control Number: 10/573,159 Page 4

Art Unit: 3724

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ASHLEY BOYER can be reached on 571 272 4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

wf /Willmon Fridie/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724